```
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
                   FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
2
                            FORT WORTH DIVISION
    UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
                                          4:15-CR-151-0(11)
3
4
    ٧.
                                          Sentencing
    BRIAN HARRIS
5
                                          December 7, 2015
6
                  BEFORE THE HONORABLE REED C. O'CONNOR
7
                       United States District Judge
                           In Fort Worth, Texas
8
9
    FOR THE GOVERNMENT:
                                     MR. SHAWN SMITH
                                     US Attorney's Office
10
                                     801 Cherry St
                                     Burnett Plaza Ste 1700 Unit #4
11
                                     Fort Worth, TX 76102-6882
                                     817/252-5200
12
                                     Fax: 817-252-5455
13
    FOR THE DEFENDANT:
                                     MR. DON L. DAVIDSON
                                     Law Office of Don Davidson
14
                                     803 Forest Ridge Dr
                                     Suite 203
15
                                     Bedford, TX 76022
                                     817/355-1285
16
                                     Fax: 817/355-1285
                                     donatty@flash.net
17
18
    COURT REPORTER:
                                     MR. DENVER B. RODEN, RMR
                                     United States Court Reporter
                                     1050 Lake Carolyn Pkwy #2338
19
                                     Irving, Texas 75039
                                     drodenrmr@sbcglobal.net
20
                                     Phone: (214) 753-2298
21
22
         The above styled and numbered cause was reported by
    computerized stenography and produced by computer.
23
24
25
```

```
(December 7, 2015.)
1
2
              THE COURT: All right. We are here now in case
    number 4:15-CR-151, the United States versus Brian Harris.
3
              Mr. Smith is here for the Government. Mr. Davidson
4
    is here for the defendant.
5
              Sir, would you state your full name for the record.
6
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              Bryan Alan Harris.
7
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir. We are here
8
9
    for purposes of your sentencing.
              Counsel, did you and your client receive in a timely
10
    manner a copy of the Presentence Investigation Report, the
11
    Addendum, and the Second Addendum to the Presentence
12
13
    Investigation Report?
              MR. DAVIDSON: I believe we did, Your Honor.
14
15
              THE COURT: Have you carefully reviewed those
    documents with your client?
16
              MR. DAVIDSON: Yes, sir.
17
18
              THE COURT: Did the Government receive this is
    timely?
19
20
              MR. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: All right. Now, there have been a number
21
    of objections filed in the case. Many of them have been
22
23
    accepted in the Addendum. Two objections I think -- the two
24
    objections that remain, the substance of them that remain,
    they may affect other guidelines, deal with the calculations
25
```

of the relevant conduct, and then also whether the mitigation role -- whether it should be -- receive a reduction for a mitigating role.

Do I understand what remains, Mr. Davidson?

MR. DAVIDSON: The mitigating role. Yes, Your Honor.

I don't remember an objection to the relevant conduct. I'm

not sure what the Court is referring to there.

THE COURT: The date --

MR. DAVIDSON: Oh.

THE COURT: -- for the calculation of --

MR. DAVIDSON: Right.

THE COURT: -- relevant conduct. Now, it seems to me that even if that date is moved forward from November 1, that because of his criminal history though sort of collateral -- I don't know if "collateral" is the right word, but sort of the consequence of moving those forward, because of the extent of his criminal history, that I'm not sure that it would make a difference on the criminal history point.

MR. DAVIDSON: Honestly, Your Honor, I don't think moving that date affects the Guideline range. My objection to that was based upon -- primarily on the fact he was released on October 31st and he did not immediately get back into dealing drugs and so I was challenging the Government's contention that that's exactly what he did and it turns out the Government produced no evidence to show that that was the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
case, they simply referred back to, well, he was involved, you
know -- well, six or seven or eight months from the time --
dating back from in June when he got arrested. We'll concede
he got back into drug dealing sometime after he got out, maybe
it was late November, maybe December, January. I'm not sure,
I'm not sure he's sure, but it wasn't right away. That was my
point.
         THE COURT: Yes. And all I'm saying is to the extent
that day gets movement -- we move it forward, I think because
of the extensive criminal history that even though we move it
forward it reduces those points at all. That's all I'm
saying.
         MR. DAVIDSON: I don't know that the does and it
certainly doesn't change the category.
         THE COURT:
                     Right.
                             Right. Okay. Very good.
                                                        Do you
wish to -- at least on the mitigating role or anything else,
do you wish to present any evidence?
         MR. DAVIDSON:
                       I do, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: Very good.
         MR. DAVIDSON: I have an exhibit, Exhibit 1, that I
would offer both for this and for my contention that he should
get a lower -- a downward variance. I think this exhibit
is relevant to both. I will provide a copy to the Government.
         May I approach?
         THE COURT: Yes, please.
```

(Handed to the Court.)

MR. DAVIDSON: For the benefit of the Court, this is the chart I put in my -- I believe it's my objections to the Addendum or my Sentence Memorandum, I'm not sure which, although I added the column on the far right.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. DAVIDSON: That I've been updating with the sentences the Court has imposed in the various codefendant cases.

And, Your Honor, as far as the mitigating role, as discussed in my Sentencing Memorandum, the Guidelines have been amended as of November 1st to -- certainly, as I understand it, to encourage courts to grant that mitigating role adjustment more often. I think the Sentencing Commission had come to the conclusion that courts were not giving it nearly enough and so they revised that guideline and they listed five factors in Subsection C of the application note and as I ride these five factors it looks like every one of them would apply to Mr. Harris. He was low down on the drug conspiracy chain and was not anywhere close to the top, as I believe that chart shows -- and, by the way, was that Exhibit 1 admitted?

THE COURT: Yes. I'm sorry. It will be admitted.

Yes. And I'd seen a version of it --

MR. DAVIDSON: Right.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: -- in your pleadings already.

(Admitted in Evidence as Defendant's Exhibit 1.

But when you look at those five MR. DAVIDSON: factors that are in the new application note, it looks like to me he mets every one of them. I feel certain at least a two level reduction for mitigating role would be appropriate and maybe a three or four level role. I just rely on what I put in the Sentencing Memorandum my objections for the rest of the explanation.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir. I will overrule the objection to the mitigating role. I feel the PSR shows in many respects that he operated his own network for the -whatever period of time he got back into the drug business -and in the paragraphs of the PSR, other than that portion of the document that discusses how he served as protection for the other person -- for the codefendant, I believe that all of the factors in the amended guideline weigh against a downward adjustment in this case.

Based upon that, I will adopt the fact findings contained in the Presentence Report and the Addendum.

I will adopt the probation officer's conclusions as to the appropriate guideline calculations and determine that they are as follows:

A total offense level of 29.

A Criminal History Category of VI.

An imprisonment range of between 151 months and 188 1 2 months. A supervised release range of between 4 and 5 years. 3 A fine range of between \$15,000 and \$5 million 4 dollars. 5 And, of course, a mandatory special assessment of 6 \$100. 7 Does the Government wish to be heard on sentencing? 8 9 MR. SMITH: No, Your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Davidson, I will turn the floor over 10 to you. I have read all of the letters and affidavits that 11 12 you have provided to me including a long and what I take to be a very heartfelt letter from the defendant and with -- and, of 13 course, I've read your pleadings, and so with that said then, 14 15 I will now turn the floor over to you for final arguments. MR. DAVIDSON: Thank you, Your Honor. And I will 16 state for the Court's benefit that that statement that the 17 18 defendant wrote he wrote and I simply typed it up and corrected a few spelling and grammatical errors. 19 20 from him, he wrote that, and I didn't change it substantively. THE COURT: Thank you. 21 MR. DAVIDSON: Your Honor, as I discuss in the 22 Sentencing Memo, a number of district court judges have 23 24 concluded that the sentence guidelines for drug cases are 25 inappropriately harsh and the statistics I quoted in that

Sentencing Memo indicate that a lot of these drug cases are resulting in downward variances, far more than result in upward variances and that those variances are reducing sentences by something like 30% from what the bottom of the guidelines is. That, the fact that will the drug quantity table last year was amended to make it slightly more lenient, the fact that, as I interpret it, the mitigating role adjustment has been made more lenient, I think the courts, the Sentencing Commission, are recognizing that these drug guidelines are too harsh, are resulting in a lot of people being put away in prison for a very long time that don't really need to be put that for that long, and I would submit that Mr. Harris's case is exactly that kind of case.

He's a low level drug trafficker who was dealing primarily because he's a drug addict and he needed money to support his drug addiction. He didn't get rich off of this scheme. He didn't make a lot of money. He just used it to get drugs to support his.

He does have an extensive criminal history; I can't argue with that, but as I pointed out in the Sentencing Memo, none of it is serious stuff, none of it is violent. The longest sentence he has ever done is two years. And this, the sentence that the Court imposes today, is going to be much longer than that, but at a minimum two and-a-half times as long as any sentence he has ever served.

A number of those judges whose opinions I quoted focus on the fact that the defendant's role in the -- in offense, the role in the conspiracy is a critical factor and I would submit that his role is -- enlists -- I understand the Court's ruling on mitigating role adjustment. I disagree with and I understand it. But this chart that I gave the Court shows that he was a fairly low level dealer. He was not dealing to his codefendants, they were dealing to him, and he was dealing in relatively minor quantities compared to most of the other defendants, codefendants. I think all of that shows that he is -- his role in the conspiracy is much more limited and lower level player than most of the codefendants.

His motivation is another critical factor I ask this Court to consider. You can read in the Presentence Report he had a very tough childhood. His family -- he comes from a family of substance abusers, whether it be alcohol or drugs. He got into it at a very early age following the pattern of his mother and stepfather and it has seized a hold of his life and really to this point ruined his life, destroyed his life. It's the cause for most of his problems, including his expensive criminal history.

The character letters that I've submitted show that at heart that he can get off of drugs; he's a good person, and that's probably true of a lot of these drug addicts. The drugs turn them into people they're not at heart.

You can see from his letter, from his guilty plea, from his statement to the PSR that he has a lot of remorse and that he wants to turn his life around and I would ask the Court to give him that chance.

We would also ask the Court respectfully to recommended that he be enrolled in the drug treatment program and he also asks that he be confined as near to this DFW area as possible because this is where his children are, this is where the mother of his children are, and he is especially with his young twins he hopes to begin to bond with them in a way that he hasn't done before because of his addiction.

I would submit that a five to six year sentence would be appropriate in this case to do justice in this case in recognition of all of the factors I've discussed.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Davidson.

Mr. Harris, do you wish to speak on your behalf or present information in mitigation of your sentence?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. I just wanted to pretty much say everything I needed to say, sir, in that letter.

That's why I sat down and wrote it. It comes from the heart.

I ask that I get help and I want to apologize to everybody for everything and that's pretty much it, sir.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

I will now state the sentence determined pursuant to Title 18 U.S.C. § 3553, treating the Sentencing Guidelines as

advisory only. 1 2 In arriving at a reasonable sentence I've taken into account primarily the conduct admitted in the Factual Resume 3 as well as those matters required to be considered by 3553. 4 It is the judgment of the Court that the defendant is 5 committed to the custody of the Federal Bureau of Prisons for 6 a period of 151 months. 7 I do not order a fine. 8 9 I do order a mandatory special assessment of \$100. It is further ordered that upon your release you be 10 placed on supervised release for a term of 4 years. 11 It is further ordered that upon your release that you 12 comply with the standard conditions contained in this judgment 13 as well as the mandatory and special conditioned stated 14 15 herein. Have you gone over those conditions of release with 16 your client? 17 MR. DAVIDSON: 18 I have, Your Honor. THE COURT: Do you understand those conditions, sir? 19 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 20 THE COURT: I will order those conditions imposed in 21 your case. 22 23 I'd believe that this is the appropriate sentence in

this case given all of the facts and circumstances and that

this sentence is sufficient, but not greater than necessary,

24

25

to comply about the statutory purposes of sentencing.

In particular, I've taken into account the arguments made by Mr. Davidson in his sentencing documents as well as the letter and the information provided to me by the defendant in his letter to me and I've balanced those with both the offense conduct at issue in this case as well as the extremely long criminal history and note that the defendant has been given multiple chances to rehabilitate and to obtain drug rehab and that nothing seems to have worked. As a result, I believe that even if I'm wrong as to my rulings as to any of these objections, this is the sentence I believe, when considering all of the appropriate 3553(a) factors, that this sentence I believe protects the public from further crimes, provides just punishment, and affords adequate deterrents.

Is there any objection from the Government to this sentence.

MR. SMITH: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: From the defense?

MR. DAVIDSON: Your Honor, for the record we would object to the sentence as unreasonable for the reasons stated in the Sentencing Memo and objections to the Presentence Report, especially with regard to the mitigating role adjustment and the request for downward variance and all the factors I cited in that regard.

THE COURT: Yes, sir. Those are all overruled for

the reasons I stated. 1 2 MR. DAVIDSON: Thank you. THE COURT: I will recommend that you be placed 3 somewhere within the DFW area, if possible, and that you be 4 able to participate in drug treatment programs, if you are 5 eligible. 6 Now, you also have the right to appeal this sentence 7 and if you decide to appeal this sentence you have the right 8 9 to apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis if you are unable to pay the costs of an appeal and if you decide to a 10 people your notice must be filed within 14 days. Talk to 11 Mr. Davidson about your appellate rights. 12 Is there anything else we should take up from the 13 Government? 14 15 MR. SMITH: No, Your Honor. THE COURT: And, Mr. Davidson? 16 MR. DAVIDSON: No, Your Honor. 17 18 THE COURT: Then good luck to you sir and thank you both for being here. 19 20 MR. DAVIDSON: That you, Your Honor. 21 22 23 24 25

I, DENVER B. RODEN, United States Court Reporter for the 1 2 United States District Court in and for the Northern District of Texas, Fort Worth Division, hereby certify that the above 3 and foregoing contains a true and correct transcription of the 4 5 proceedings in the above entitled and numbered cause. WITNESS MY HAND on this 10th day of January, 2016. 6 7 8 /s/ Denver B. Roden 9 DENVER B. RODEN, RMR 10 United States Court Reporter 1050 Lake Carolyn Parkway #2338 11 Irving, Texas 75039 drodenrmr@sbcglobal.net 12 Phone: (214) 753-2298 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25